

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated February 20, 2007. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Drawings, Specification and Claims herein are respectfully believed to satisfy all requirements of the Examiner with regard to the objections and rejections in paragraphs 1-7 of the Office Action.

Support for the amendments to the claims made herein is present at various places in the Specification and Drawings as originally filed. For example, inputting the plurality of questions reflecting a software system design is supported by the disclosure at lines 10-12 on page 3, lines 14-16 on page 4, lines 6-8 on page 10, lines 5-7 on page 13, claims 5, 11 and 17 as originally filed, and in the Abstract lines 14-16. Generating a category array is supported by the disclosure at line 22 on page 3 through line 3 on page 4, lines 12-19 on page 10, lines 9-11 on page 13, and step 124 of Fig. 5. That an operational characteristic input by the disclosed system may be a configuration value is supported by the disclosure at page 6 line 17 through page 7 line 7. Displaying the questions is supported by the disclosure in lines 6-8 on page 8, and step 70 of Fig. 2. Locating a design guideline in the category array is shown by the steps of Fig. 4, as is the displaying of the name of a data store to be used to store an operational characteristic (see 98, 100, 102 and 104 of Fig. 4).

At paragraphs 8-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-14 and 17-20 for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102 by U.S. Patent number 5,960,419 of Fagg, III et al. ("Fagg"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Fagg discloses an authoring system for creating an application for a decision management system such as a document assembly system. The Fagg method includes creating sets of question procedures, answer procedures and advice procedures for a particular application. When later executed, the Fagg procedures generate, respectively, questions, answer choices, and advice for a user of the application. Also created in Fagg are procedures that may be referenced in one or more of the question, answer, or advice procedures for generating content based on an analysis of one or more answers previously provided by a user in response to a question. The content provided by these referenced procedures in Fagg becomes part of the question, answer, or advice provided by the respective procedure making the reference.

Nothing in Fagg discloses or suggests a method for acquiring and distributing information regarding architectural decisions to developers of a software system under development, including:

- inputting a plurality of questions, wherein said plurality of questions reflect a system design of said software system under development, and wherein said plurality of questions include questions regarding whether a configuration value associated with a component of said software system under development is the same for all users;

- generating a category array in response to said plurality of questions, *wherein each element in said category array corresponds to a unique set of answers to said plurality of questions, and wherein each element in said category array contains a corresponding one of a plurality of design guidelines, each of said plurality of design guidelines indicating a name of a corresponding one of a plurality of data stores;*

- inputting an operational characteristic of a component of said software system under development, wherein said operational characteristic is said configuration value associated with said component of said software system under development;

- displaying said at least one question regarding said at least one operational characteristic;

- inputting at least one answer to said at least one question;

- locating, responsive to said at least one answer and said category array, one of said plurality of design guidelines related to said at least one operational characteristic, wherein said located one of said plurality of design guidelines is a name of a data store to be used to store said operational characteristic;* and

- displaying said name of said data store to be used to store said operational characteristic. (emphasis added)

as in the present claim 1. In contrast, the system of Fagg is concerned with displaying to a user representations of program blocks that contain text, block references, and conditional statements, and that are parts of an application program under development. Nothing in Fagg is concerned with identifying in any way a name of a data store to be used to store an operational characteristic from a set of design guidelines stored in a category array representing a unique set of answers to a plurality of questions, as in the present claim 1.

For these reasons Applicant respectfully urges that Fagg fails to disclose or suggest all the features of the present claim 1. Claim 1 is accordingly not anticipated by Fagg under 35 U.S.C. 102.

At paragraphs 10-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15 and 16 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing Fagg in combination with U.S. Patent number 6,236,994 of Swartz et al. ("Swartz et al."). While these dependent claims have been cancelled herein, Applicant further notes that the combination of Fagg with Swartz et al. also fails to disclose or suggest even the desirability of identifying in any way a name of a data store to be used to store an operational characteristic from a set of design guidelines stored in a category array representing a unique set of answers to a plurality of questions, as in the present claim 1. The combination of Fagg and Swartz et al. accordingly does not form a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to the present claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicants have amended claim 1 and cancelled the remaining claims from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 5, 2007

Date

/David Dagg/

David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-003